



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,822	09/11/2003	Jason R. Delker	2306	5940
28005 7590 01/24/2007 SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			EXAMINER VU, MICHAEL T	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/659,822

Applicant(s)

DELKER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Vu

Art Unit

2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continue sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

ADVISORY ACTION

On page 2 lines 19-20, of Applicant's Remarks, Applicant argues that Sasano/Silverman fails to teach a "method of managing a plurality of directory numbers for a mobile station".

On page 3 lines 6-7 Sasano/Silverman fails to teach "associating said first directory number with an identifier code". And "transmitting a query to a call control system, said query identifying said first directory number".

On page 4 lines 1-2 and 6 Sasano/Silverman fails to teach "transmitting over an air interface a first message to said mobile station, said first message including said identifier code and recognized by said mobile station".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner must give the broadest reasonable interpretation to all claims 1, 9, and 14 that Sasano teaches such circumstances method that managing a plurality of directory numbers for a communication terminal, in which equates to a mobile station (See Col. 3, line 15-39). Moreover, Sasano/Silverman teach the concept of the invention but do not disclose the use for a mobile station.

However, as examiner highly noted that on the Office Action filed on June 5, 2006 that Sasano does not disclose the use of mobile station. Furthermore, Sasano teaches the concept of transmitting a first message (i.g. incoming call that includes the sub-address) to the telephone system and/or terminal, the message including the ID

Art Unit: 2617

code to indicate that the first directory number being called (displaying specified sub-address, called or caller's phone number), (See an Office Action filed on June 5, 2006).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify of Sasano concept by using different network environment, such as a wireless network.

In response to applicant's Remarks/Arguments, an applicant argued that Sasano/Silverman fails to teach the "transmitting a query to a call control system, said query identifying said first directory number" on page 4, line 9-10.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner must give the broadest reasonable interpretation that the combination of Sasano/Silverman, and in further view of Zimmerman teach the transmitting a query to a call control system, said query identifying said first directory number such as Mobile Switching Center (MSC), Service Control Point (SCP), and Home Location Register (HLR), See figures 1-6, paragraph [0023-0044], of Zimmerman, and (See Col. 1, line 16-25, and Col. 7, line 5-32) of Silverman.

In response to applicant's Remarks/Arguments, an applicant argued that Sasano/Silverman fails to teach the "transmitting over an air interface a first message to said mobile station, said first message including said identifier code" on page 5, line 5-7, and "an identifier code recognized by said mobile station" on page 5, line 13.

However, the examiner must give the broadest reasonable interpretation, and highly noted that on the Office Action filed on June 5, 2006 that Sasano does not disclose the use of mobile station. Furthermore, Sasano teaches the concept of

Art Unit: 2617

transmitting a first message (i.g. incoming call that includes the sub-address) to the telephone system and/or terminal, the message including the ID code to indicate that the first directory number being called (displaying specified sub-address, called or caller's phone number), (See an Office Action filed on June 5, 2006).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify of Sasano concept by using different network environment, such as a wireless network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael T. Vu whose telephone number (571) 272-8131. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 272-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-9000.



Michael Vu
Examiner

JEAN GELIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

